

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 253-262, and 276-287 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,185.

Claims 263-275 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,185, in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,697,184 to Cheal et al.

Enclosed herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer which obviates these rejections.

The Examiner has requested that the specification and drawings be edited by the Applicant similar to that in the parent U.S. Patent No. 6,249,185, which will reflect only the supporting matter for the claims. The specification and drawings have been similarly edited to remove extraneous information and figures relating to the overall RFID system, and to make the application and any resulting patent more manageable as requested by the Examiner.

A Substitute Drawing Request, along with formal Drawing Sheet 1/1 showing renumbered Figs. 1 and 2, and a red-inked drawing sheet showing the corrections, is being filed concurrently with this Response.

A copy of the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, filed on June 28, 2002 is attached hereto for review by the Examiner. The Examiner has

indicated that no Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement was attached to the Transmittal Form signed by D. Brent Kenady on June 28, 2002. However, the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, along with the Form PTO-1449 and cited references, were listed on the PTO Postcard Receipt and the Ex Post Declaration of Express Mailing, and is properly stamped with Express Mail No. EV026157028. Copies of the PTO Postcard Receipt and the Ex Post Declaration of Express Mailing are attached for the Examiner's convenience. Since no fees were due at the time of filing this Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement on June 28, 2002, Applicant believes that with submission of this copy of the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement as filed, and supporting documents, no additional fees are due at this time for filing an Information Disclosure Statement.

Further as requested by the Examiner in Paragraph 8 of the Action, Applicant has reviewed all previously filed Information Disclosure Statements, and has determined that a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 24, 2004, has not be initialed by the Examiner. A copy of that Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement as filed is attached hereto for the Examiner's convenience. With the submission of the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statements and Forms PTO-1449 as filed on June 28, 2002 and June 24, 2004, all art known by the Applicants has been provided to the Patent Office. Consideration by the Examiner and initialing of the references is respectfully requested.


The Examiner has stated that the Information Disclosure Statement filed February 20, 2002, failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) since it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance of each patent listed which is not provided with an English translation. A Substitute Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of claims 253-287 is requested. The Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned in the event that the next Office Action is one other than a Notice of Allowance. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept. 29, 2004

By:



Deepak Malhotra
Reg. No. 33,560